



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,337	01/31/2001	Anil K. Singhani	FIS9-2000-0281	5977

45828 7590 08/16/2005

WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD, SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/773,337

Applicant(s)

SINGHANI ET AL.

Examiner

Brandon S. Hoffman

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7 are pending in this office action.
2. Applicant's arguments, filed June 29, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starr (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,606) in view of Zey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,275).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Starr teaches a process/data processing system for managing business, technical and operational data which uses a single interface in a shared space environment over the Internet comprising the steps of:

- Providing a supplier portal from which new guests indicate, using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) of the supplier portal Web page, whether they are a registered user or not (col. 10, lines 13-21);

Art Unit: 2136

- Determining whether a guest is a registered user from input by the guest, and if not a registered user, prompting the guest to select "Register" to link to guest registration (GR) where they can obtain a Web userid/password that enables them to obtain user-level registration for any of global procurement applications available under the supplier portal (col. 10, lines 21-28);
- When a guest obtains a Web userid/password in GR, storing guest information in a GR data store (col. 10, lines 28-30);
- Determining whether any applications have been authorized for a registered guest and, if not, prompting the guest to register for restricted applications in a portal common registration (PCR) where information is stored in a PCR data store throughout an application's approval cycle (col. 10, lines 30-47);
- Accessing information from the GR data store to automatically build a customized home page for the guest, this home page being modified and updated as the guest's requests for access to applications get approved (col. 10, line 47 through col. 11, line 11);
- Determining whether approval is needed for a requested application and, if so, sending a request for approval to the application administrator and receiving a response from the application administrator (col. 11, lines 12-35); and
- Storing links to all applications for which the guest is approved, these links being reflected in the personalized supplier portal home page which displays a list of links to all of the applications for which the guest has been registered and authorized (col. 10, lines 4-12).

Starr does not teach sending a request by e-mail for approval.

Zey et al. teaches sending a request by e-mail for approval (col. 8, lines 23-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine sending a request by e-mail for approval, as taught by Zey et al., with the process/system of Starr. It would have been obvious for such modifications because sending e-mail to the subscriber by the administrator for approval properly notifies the subscriber of their rights (approved/denied) for a particular application. Using e-mail provides an automated and fast method for reaching the subscriber.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Starr in view of Zey et al. teaches further comprising the steps of:

- Defining 1 to n level approval cycles a user must go through to get authorized to access an application (see col. 9, lines 20-30 of Starr);
- Logging in by a registered guest by inputting the guest's userid/password once for each session, as long as applications requested by the guest are in a same realm (see col. 8, lines 37-65 of Starr); and

Art Unit: 2136

- Invoking by a logged in guest any of their approved applications by simply clicking the link to the desired application in the guest's customized home page (see col. 8, lines 21-25 of Starr).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Starr in view of Zey et al. teaches wherein the approval cycles are customizable for each application (see col. 9, lines 26-30 of Starr).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Starr in view of Zey et al. teaches wherein the approval cycles are defined for a section of an application, providing a finer level of access control (see col. 9, lines 22-26 of Starr).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Starr in view of Zey et al. teaches wherein application specific registration fields are defined so that a registration form, unique to an application, is displayed when a user requests access to an application (see col. 8, lines 37-51 of Starr).

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner believes it to be inherent that guests may bookmark applications for later access (because web interfaces can be bookmarked), further comprising the step of prompting by an application a guest to enter their userid/password for authentication against data stored in the GR data store when the

Art Unit: 2136

application is accessed using a bookmark (when a site is bookmarked that requires authentication, future accesses to the site will require re-authentication).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant argues that Zey et al. (secondary reference) does not teach sending by e-mail a request for approval, but rather generating an e-mail for providing a requester with notice as to whether approval has been denied or granted (page 8, first full paragraph).

Regarding applicant's arguments, examiner disagrees. The cited passage (col. 8, lines 23-37) does state e-mail is sent to the requester either approving or denying the requester's request. However, the way the requester initially requests a change of service is by filling out information on a website and hitting the SUBMIT button (see figs. 7-10, namely fig. 10, ref. num 72). As is well known, the SUBMIT button POST's the information to a database where it is then e-mailed to the recipient for processing. Also, cited by Zey et al. at column 1, lines 13-25, the background of the art discloses prior systems that sent both REQUESTS and responses to requests by e-mail. Therefore, e-mail is sent to the administrator and subsequently returned back to the requester with an approval or denial as claimed.

Applicant also argues Zey et al. does not teach sending the e-mail for the purpose of requesting to use a requested application. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by

Art Unit: 2136

attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Examiner cited Starr (primary reference) as the reference for disclosing the purpose of requesting to use a requested application, not Zey et al. However, it can be argued that Zey et al.'s email is sent for the purpose of requesting to use a requested application. The maintenance requests are either approved or denied, and when approved, allows the requester to partake in a computer update or maintenance. If the update or maintenance requires the use of an application that would not normally be utilized by the requesting computer, the application would be considered as needing approval for use. With that said, the application is approved for the requester, at least for the time it takes to perform the maintenance.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2136

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon S. Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brandon S. Hoffman

BH

Ol
Primary Examiner
AU 2131
8/12/05